

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/098,714	03/15/2002	Kevin D. MacLean	NMTC-0770	3043	
	7590 10/05/200 ERICAL TECHNOLOG	EXAMINER			
C/O PARK, VA	AUGHAN & FLEMING	ALHIJA,	ALHIJA, SAIF A		
2820 FIFTH STREET DAVIS, CA 95618-7759			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2128		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|--|

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/098,714	MACLEAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Saif A. Alhija	2128		

Defens the Filims of an Annual Duick							
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Saif A. Alhija	2128					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 04 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
I. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS	had a size to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered b	200110				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co 			ecause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wi vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,5,7,9-11,13,17,19-21,23,25,27 and</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>1 29-33</u> .	•					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13. Other:							
	•						
		•					

KAMINI SHAM EXAMINEF SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEF



Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant is arguing limitations that were not previously raised, for example the limitations regarding simulation repetition that were not previously presented in the argued independent claims. The Examiner notes that MPEP Section 714.02 states "The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner 's action and [[must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action]]."

Further, the Examiner contended that the reference to a correction post-processor in Cobb was to illustrate that the layouts are further corrected regardless of re-calculation. The Examiner further notes that MPEP Section 7.39.01 states that "a final rejection ... is intended to [[close the prosecution of this application]]." However the Examiner responds by citing Cobb on page 5 which states "Correction post-processor 112 makes the determined corrections for each area. For each "unique" area, the simulation and correction process is performed multiple limes, iteratively, referencing desired results 106, until the corrected mask layout is considered to be sufficiently precompensated that it is likely to yield the desired image, within a predetermined tolerance level. Correction database 114 stores the data necessary to allow two areas to be compared and determined whether they are equivalent for OPC purposes. Furthermore, correction database 114 stores the data necessary to allow the corrections determined for one area to be reused for another area, when the latter area is determined to be equivalent to the former area for OPC purposes." The Examiner is puzzled by Applicants arguments with respect to this section since clearly Cobb is disclosing that following simulation the resultant model is corrected. It is unclear where a functional or patentable distinction lies since the resultant of Cobbs is explicitly corrected and would therefore avoid the necessity of having to reperform the simulation which follows Applicants claimed invention in which an equivalence determination is made to avoid the necessity of having to re-perform the simulations from scratch.

2